APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,448	01/18/2002	Rodney W. Schmidt	2000.057300	1902

23720	7590	03/11/2004

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100
HOUSTON, TX 77042

EXAMINER
NAMAZI, MEHDI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2188	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
	10/051,448	SCHMIDT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	**Examiner**	**Art Unit**
	Mehdi Namazi	2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/17/2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to request for reconsideration filed December 17, 2003.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, and 12 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kodaira et al. (U.S. Patent 4,835,734).

As per claims 1, 11, and 12, Kodaira teaches a method comprising: receiving a

virtual address; comparing at least a portion of the virtual address to a first preselected

range (fig. 4, element 81, col. 5, lines 25-30, shows portion of virtual address and been

compared by comparator 55 first preselected address in register); using a first

mechanism to generate a first physical address from the virtual address in response to

the virtual address being outside the first preselected range (fig. 4, element 12, col. 5,

lines 32-33, is the first mechanism); and using a second mechanism to generate a

second physical address from the virtual address in response to the virtual address

being within the first preselected range (fig. 4, element 11, or second mechanism).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 2-10, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kodaira, and further in view of Christenson.

As per claims 2, and 13, Kodaire teaches the claimed invention, but fails to teach

wherein using the first mechanism to generate the first physical address from the virtual

address in response to the virtual address being outside the first preselected range

further comprises using a paging mechanism to generate the first physical address from

the virtual address in response to the virtual address being outside the first preselected

range.

Christenson teaches if the virtual address is out of range generating an interrupt

to indicate an address error, and if the virtual is not out of range the virtual address is

translated to physical address using a page table (col.10, lines 55-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to

modify the work of Kodaira because Christenson teaches use of page table for

translating virtual addresses into physical addresses in order to avoid usage of memory

more then needed, and having less traffic.

As per claim 8, Kodaire teaches the claimed invention, but fails to teach storing

at least one value representative of the first preselected range during an initialization

period (cols. 7-8, lines 61-5).

Christenson teaches processor executes program instructions (preselected)

stored in main memory to be access by processor during start up (col. 7, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to

modify the work of Kodaira because Christenson teaches executing program

instructions (preselected) by processor during start up in order to manage the resources

of computer system such as address translation mechanism, main memory (col. 8, lines

1-5)

As per claims 3, and 14, Christenson teaches wherein using the second

mechanism to generate the second physical address from the virtual address in

response to the virtual address being within the first preselected range further

comprises using a hard mapped mechanism to generate the second physical address

from the virtual address in response to the virtual address being within the first

preselected range (col. 1, lines 49-59).

As per claim 4, Christenson teaches storing an entry for a page table in the

second physical address, wherein the page table entry may be used by the paging

mechanism to generate the first physical address from the virtual address (col. 10, lines

55-57).

As per claim 5, Christenson teaches storing at least one value representative of

the second physical address during an initialization period, wherein the second

mechanism uses the at least one value to generate the second physical address (cols. 7-8, lines 61-5).

As per claim 6, Christenson teaches storing the at least one value representative of the second physical address during the initialization period further comprises storing the at least one value representative of the second physical address during only the initialization period (cols. 7-8, lines 61-5).

As per claim 7, Christenson teaches storing the at least one value representative of the second physical address during the initialization period further comprises using secure kernel software to store the at least one value representative of the second physical address during the initialization period (cols. 7-8, lines 61-5).

As per claim 9, Christenson wherein storing the at least one value representative of the first preselected range during the initialization period further comprises storing the at least one value representative of the first preselected range during only the initialization period (cols. 7-8, lines 61-5).

As per claims 10, 15, and 16, Christenson teaches wherein storing the at least one value representative of the first preselected range during the initialization period further comprises using secure kernel software to store the at least one value representative of the first preselected range during the initialization period (col. 1, lines 16-26).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mehdi Namazi whose telephone number is 703-306-2758. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 703-306-2903. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mehdi Namazi
Examiner
Art Unit 2188

March 7, 2004

Mano Padmanabhan
3/8/04

Mano Padmanabhan
Supervisory Patent Examiner
TC 2100